



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,339	08/24/2001	Densen Cao	5045.2	3615
7	590 04/10/2003			
Daniel P. McCarthy PARSONS, BEHLE & LATIMER 201 South Main Street, Suite 1800			EXAMINER	
			JACKSON JR, JEROME	
P.O. Box 4589 Salt Lake City,	8 UT 84145-0898		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2815	

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			- W
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
	Office Addison Commence	09/939,339	CAO, DENSEN
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Jerome Jackson Jr.	2815
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPIMALING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ansions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a ply within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11	March 2003 .	
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ T	his action is non-final.	
3) 🗌 Dispositi	Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde ion of Claims		
4)⊠	Claim(s) 55-78 is/are pending in the applicat	on.	
ı	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.	
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) 55-78 is/are rejected.		
7) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	
Applicati	on Papers		
-	The specification is objected to by the Examin		
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 August 2001</u> is/are:	•	•
	Applicant may not request that any objection to t		• •
11) 📙 `	The proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Examiner.
400	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	, -	
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer.	
	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documen		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen		·· ·
* S	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price application from the International Base the attached detailed Office action for a lis	ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•
14) 🗌 A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	tic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).
) The translation of the foreign language pracknowledgment is made of a claim for domes		
Attachment	t(s)		
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
J.S. Patent and Tr PTO-326 (Re		ction Summary	Part of Paper No. 9

-, Application/Control Number: 09/939,339

Art Unit: 2815

DETAILED ACTION

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 55-78 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,465,961 in view of Sugiura '979 or Watabe '281. Cao '961 claims all the elements except the specifics of the semiconductor light emitting device such as multi-quantum well DBR structure. These specifics are obvious well known structure and suggested by Sugiura or Watabe for the purpose of improving light emission. See figure 9 of '979 where multi-quantum well DBR structures 51 and 59 are shown, or Watabe column 4 lines 1-10.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2815

Claims 55-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Begemann '722 in view of Abe '230, Sugiura and Watabe.

Begemann teaches a multiple led light source as applicant with a primary heat sink 3 and multiple secondary heat sinks 12, and led chips 4. One difference is that Begemann does not teach a phosphor coating. This difference is not patentable because Abe suggests phosphor coating for producing bright white light. Another difference is that Begemann does not teach the specifics of the chips as claimed. These differences are not patentable because the claimed specifics are obvious in view of Sugiura and Watabe who teach and suggest GaN based leds with DBR reflectors for the purpose of bright emission at blue wavelengths. Electrically insulative substrates are obvious from the sapphire substrate teachings of Sugiura and electrically conductive substrates are shown by substrate 1 of Watabe.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Jackson Jr. whose telephone number is 703 308 4937. The examiner can normally be reached on t-th 9-5. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 308 7722 for regular communications and 703 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 0956.

jj April 3, 2003

JEROMÉ JACKSON PRIMARY EXAMINER